UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/534,942	02/06/2006	Adolf Gustav Zajber	НМ-648РСТ	1669
40570 7590 04/10/2008 FRIEDRICH KUEFFNER			EXAMINER	
	AVENUE, SUITE 91		LIN, KUANG Y	
NEW YORK, NY 10017			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/534,942	ZAJBER ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kuang Y. Lin	1793
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Description of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tired will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 € This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are pending in the appli 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 4-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2008 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	e: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/534,942 Page 2

Art Unit: 1793

- The specification is objected to under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph in that the 1. disclosure is written in a non-idiomatic expression such that renders the meaning vague and indefinite. For example, in page 2, line 16+ and page 7, line 1+, respectively, (amended), in what manner "the geometrical shape of inner cross-section and the corresponding dimensions are set analogous to the locally deducible quantity of solidification heat"? In page 4, line 21 (amended), the recess is formed in the mold, rather than in the casting. Also, the degree of recession decreases in the direction toward the casting exit side, rather than stated otherwise. Further, since the mold disclosed is in the rectangular shape, it is not clear what "narrow side is referred to. In page 5, line 11+, and page 8, line 21+, respectively, (amended), what is the "planeparallel surface"? In page 7, line 8 (amended) and page 7, line 13 (original), respectively, it refers to "the exterior form 12" and the geometrical cross-section form". It is not clear what "form" is referred to, i.e., does it refers to "thickness", "dimension" or something else? In page 8, line 15 + (amended), the recess is adapted to an amount of contraction along the height of the mold, rather than "of the height" of the mold. In page 8, line 21+ (amended), what is the meaning of "plane-parallel"?
- 2. Claims 1 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph for the same reasons as set forth in the objected to the specification supra.
- 3. Claims 1, and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/534,942 Page 3

Art Unit: 1793

These claim are written in a narrative format rather than an objective format and thereby they do not positively and directly include all the structural elements which are referred thereto, i.e. the shape or configuration of the mold is described in turn of the heat removing condition during casting process which is extraneous to the structure of the casting mold. In claim 1, the expression of "particularly molten steel" renders indefinite in scope of the claim. Also, what is "preliminary section castings"? and what is "curve representing temperature progression" and "curve representing heat dissipation"? Does it means "temperature profile", and "the amount of heat dissipation", respectively? It is noted that in page 6, last paragraph of the specification, it states that diagram "D" shows the process during the dissipation of solidification heat from the casting. It is not clear how the diagram "D" shows the process during dissipation of solidification heat. In claim 7, how the length of the recess can corresponds to the amount of contraction? Also, what narrow side is referred to? In claim 8, it is written in a non-idiomatic manner such that it is not clear what mold structure is claimed.

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 1 and 8 **insofar as definite** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either US 6,340,048 to Tsune et al., or US 4,207,941 to Shrum and further in view of US 5,467,809 to Arvedi et al.

Each of the primary references substantially shows the invention as claimed except that they do not show to reduce the mold wall volume by means of notches. However, Arvedi et al. show to provide notches on the exterior of the mold wall such that to provide more coolant contacting surface and thereby to speed up the heat removal process. It would have been obvious to provide the notches of Arvedi et al. in the mold wall of the primary references in view of the advantage. Applicant is advised that the language of "locally deducible quantity of the solidification heat for the continuous casting", "progress of the temperature diagram across the mold height", "the dissipated heat quantity per time unit", etc. do not further provide any structural limitation for the continuous casting mold as claimed.

7. Claims 4-7 **insofar as definite** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either US 6,340,048 to Tsune et al., or US 4,207,941 to Shrum in

Art Unit: 1793

view of US 5,467,809 to Arvedi et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 5,343,931 to Striuli et al. or JP 6-31,401.

Striuli et al. show a continuous casting mold containing a substantially central, approximately parabola-shaped recess for reducing of the concentration of tensions in the strand skin and lessening of tendency to tearing of strand skin during strand withdrawal process. JP '401 shows to provide an outward bulging at each side of mold plate to prevent the damage of the solidified shell. It would have been obvious to further provide the continuous casting mold of the primary references with the central, approximately parabola-shaped recess of the secondary references in view of the advantage.

8. Applicant's arguments filed Jan. 23, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's main argument is in that the cited prior art references do not teach the continuous casting mold having an inner geometrical cross-section form and associated dimensions that are designed analogous to a locally deducible quantity of a solidification heat for the continuous casting according to a temperature profile along the mold height. However, those limitations are directed to process of making a mold and thus do not define over the prior art reference. Since the modified shape or configuration of the continuous casting mold of the primary reference in view of the secondary reference is resemble or similar to that of instant application, **the mold as claimed** does not define over the prior art reference.

Application/Control Number: 10/534,942 Page 6

Art Unit: 1793

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kuang Y. Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-1179. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 10:00-6:30,.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kuang Y. Lin/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793

4-9-08